

REMARKS

Summary of the Decision on Appeal from BPAI

The BPAI has affirmed the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-14 made in the Final Office Action dated August 31, 2005.

Summary of Applicant's Response

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are pending, with claims 16-29 having been withdrawn from consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 2 and 3F in view of Kakuda et al. (US 5,162,933). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites an array substrate including a plurality of thin film transistors each including a source electrode "extended from each of data lines" and a metal layer "formed on an entire surface...of the source electrode." In direct contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Applicant's Related Art FIGs. 2 and 3F and Kakuda et al. fail to teach or suggest "a metal layer formed on an *entire surface of each of the data lines and the source electrode*, and *at peripheral portions* of the drain electrode," as recited by amended independent claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Applicant's Related Art nor Kakuda et al. teach or

suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in amended independent claim 1, and hence dependent claims 2-14.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested, and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: May 23, 2007

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001